

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Case No. 18-CR-0268 (PJS/TNL)

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

PETER MARTIN (2), JAVIER LOPEZ-
LOPEZ (3), and JUAN DANIEL
VALDEZ-MENDOZA (4),

Defendants.

David P. Steinkamp, UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, for plaintiff.

Kevin W. DeVore, DEVORE LAW OFFICE, P.A., for defendant Peter Martin.

Lisa M. Lopez, OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL DEFENDER, for defendant Javier Lopez-Lopez.

Thomas H. Shiah, LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS H. SHIAH, LTD., for defendant Juan Daniel Valdez-Mendoza.

Defendants Peter Martin, Javier Lopez-Lopez, and Juan Daniel Valdez-Mendoza are charged with conspiring to distribute and possess with intent to distribute methamphetamine, and with possessing with intent to distribute methamphetamine. ECF No. 36 at 1-2. Martin is also charged with possessing an unregistered firearm. *Id.* at 2. The defendants have brought motions to suppress statements they made to law

enforcement officers following their arrests, as well as motions to suppress physical evidence uncovered during searches (pursuant to warrants) of their cell phones and a shared residence. Magistrate Judge Tony N. Leung issued a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) on May 20, 2019 recommending that the Court deny the defendants’ motions to suppress statements and physical evidence. *See* ECF No. 116.

This matter is before the Court on Martin and Valdez-Mendoza’s objections to the R&R.¹ ECF Nos. 122, 123. The Court has conducted a de novo review. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Crim. P. 59(b)(3). In objecting to the R&R, defendants rely entirely on the arguments that they made before Judge Leung. The Court agrees with Judge Leung’s analysis of those arguments. The Court therefore adopts the R&R.

ORDER

Based on all of the files, records, and proceedings herein, the Court ADOPTS the R&R [ECF No. 116]. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. Defendant Peter Martin’s motion to suppress defendant’s statements [ECF No. 68] is DENIED.
2. Defendant Peter Martin’s motion to suppress evidence obtained as a result of search and seizure [ECF No. 69] is DENIED.

¹Lopez-Lopez did not file any objections to the R&R.

3. Defendant Javier Lopez-Lopez's motion to suppress statements, admissions, and answers [ECF No. 78] is DENIED.
4. Defendant Javier Lopez-Lopez's motion to suppress evidence obtained as a result of search and seizure [ECF No. 77] is DENIED.
5. Defendant Juan Daniel Valdez-Mendoza's motion to suppress any statements made by defendant [ECF No. 80] is DENIED.
6. Defendant Juan Daniel Valdez-Mendoza's motion to suppress any evidence obtained as a result of any illegal searches [ECF No. 81] is DENIED.

Dated: June 26, 2019

s/Patrick J. Schiltz

Patrick J. Schiltz

United States District Judge